

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/630,193	07/29/2003	Teruhiko Fujiwara	02022D/HG	9238	
1933 75	590 12/10/2003		EXAM	EXAMINER	
FRISHAUF, HOLTZ, GOODMAN & CHICK, PC 767 THIRD AVENUE			POKER, JENNIFER A		
25TH FLOOR	ENUE		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
NEW YORK,	NY 10017-2023		2832		
		•	DATE MAIL ED: 12/10/200	1	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			Mc			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	40			
·	10/630,193	FUJIWARA ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examin r	Art Unit				
	Jennifer A Poker	2832				
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet	with the correspondence address -	•			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a rep - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status	136(a). In no event, however, mar oly within the statutory minimum of will apply and will expire SIX (6) Note, cause the application to become	y a reply be timely filed thirty (30) days will be considered timely. MONTHS from the mailing date of this communicals ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	ution.			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 J	<i>July 2003</i> .					
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ⊠ This	s action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowated in accordance with the practice under			sis			
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-4</u> is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra	awn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.		,				
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-4</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.	or election requirement					
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	or election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examination 10) The description (a) filed on 20, take 2003 is (assumble)		icated to by the Everiner				
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>29 July 2003</u> is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct			1(d)			
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	•		` '			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreignal All by Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Bureat * See the attached detailed Office action for a list 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domest since a specific reference was included in the first 37 CFR 1.78. a) The translation of the foreign language processes the priority document is made of a claim for domest reference was included in the first sentence of the priority document is made of a claim for domest reference was included in the first sentence of the priority document is made of a claim for domest reference was included in the first sentence of the priority document is made of a claim for domest reference was included in the first sentence of the priority document is made of a claim for domest reference was included in the first sentence of the priority document is made of a claim for domest reference was included in the first sentence of the priority document is made of a claim for domest reference was included in the first sentence of the priority document is made of a claim for domest reference was included in the first sentence of the priority document is made of a claim for domest reference was included in the first sentence of the priority document is made of a claim for domest reference was included in the first sentence of the priority document is made of a claim for domest reference was included in the first sentence of the priority document is made of a claim for domest reference was included in the first sentence of the priority document is made of a claim for document is made of a	ats have been received. Its have been received in Its priority under 35 U.S. Its received in Its priority under 35 U.S. Its priority under 35 U.S.	n Application No en received in this National Stage not received. C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application or in an Application Data S s been received. C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a spec	Sheet. ific			
Attachment(s)		A (DTT (10) D (11)	•			
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 	5) 🔲 Notice	w Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)	_•			

Art Unit: 2832

DETAILED ACTION

General Status

1. This is a first action on the merits of application filed on July 29, 2003. Claims 1-4 are pending and are being examined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 - The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 4. Claims 1, 2, and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claim 1, the applicant states, "...having a particle size of 150 micrometers or less." It was not clear as to whether the applicant was describing the size of the insulator particles or the magnetic powder particles. The examiner understood that it was to describe the size of the magnetic powder particles. Prior art was applied accordingly.

Regarding claim 2, examiner understood that all conditions were met under applied magnetic field of 12,000 A/m, 20 kHz, and .1T

Regarding claim 4, applicant claims, "...a winding wound around said powder core." It was unclear if this winding is the same as the winding previously claimed in claim 1 or if it is an additional winding. Based on the language of the claim, Examiner understood it to be the same winding. Prior art was applied accordingly.

Art Unit: 2832

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 4,956,011 to Nishida, et al, in view of Japanese Patent Number 63-291,859 to Horinouchi, et al, further in view of U.S. Patent Number 4,272,749 to Tuji.

Nishida, et al, discloses a powder magnetic core comprising:

- (1) A 2-12% of silicon; (Abstract)
- (2) A 0.05-0.95% of oxygen; (Abstract)
- (3) A balance being essentially iron; (Abstract)
- (4) An average diameter of the alloy powder being 10-100 micrometers. (Abstract)

Each of these ranges fall within the ranges as claimed by the applicant.

Additionally, Nishida, et al, states that it has been known in the art to incorporate inter-particle insulation, such that the powder particles are insulated by epoxy resin or sodium silicate to-avoid direct contact between powder particles and decrease eddy current losses in the high-frequency region. (Column 1, lines 36-44) (Column 3, lines 6-7)

Nishida, et al, discloses the claimed invention except for the composition of the insulation layer comprising SiO₂ and MgO.

Horinouchi, et al, discloses a core material, having excellent thermal conductivity, electrical insulating properties and dimensional accuracy, by blending alumina powder with a flux consisting of CaO, MgO and SiO.

Art Unit: 2832

Nishida, et al, in view of Horinouchi, et al, discloses the claimed invention except for the core's incorporation into a reactor.

Tuji discloses a reactor formed by winding a conductor on a core, which is formed by using mutually insulated particles of iron powder to provide a closed magnetic path.

One skilled in the art, at the time the invention was made, would have found it obvious to combine the teachings of Nishida, et al, Horinouchi, et al, and Tuji, and incorporate into a powder core an inter-particle insulation comprising MgO and SiO for the purpose of providing excellent thermal conductivity and electrical insulation properties and to further utilize the powder core in a reactor in order to obtain have high permeability and low losses.

6. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 4,956,011 to Nishida, et al, in view of Japanese Patent Number 63-291,859 to Horinouchi, et al, further in view of U.S. Patent Number 4,272,749 to Tuji, as applied to claim 1 above and further in view of U.S. Patent Number 4,637,843 to Takayama, et al.

Nishida, et al, in view of Horinouchi, et al, further in view of Tuji discloses the claimed invention except for a gap in the core.

Takayama, et al, discloses a core, which may comprise at least one cut air gap in the magnetic path. Usually, this gap is from 0.001 to 0.05 times the length of the magnetic path. Usually, the at least one cut air gap is filled with a spacer made of, for example, polyethylene terephthalate. (Column 17, lines 1-14)

One skilled in the art, at the time the invention was made, would have found it obvious to combine the teachings of Nishida, et al, Horinouchi, et al, Tuji, and Takayama, et al, and incorporate a gap or a spacer within the core in order to prevent magnetic saturation of d.c. current.

Art Unit: 2832

Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claim 2 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112,

second paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim

and any intervening claims.

8. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: no prior

art of reference or combination thereof teaches or suggests a powder core having an a.c. permeability

of at least 20 under applied d.c. magnetic field of 12,000 A/m AND a core loss of 1,000 kW/m³ under

Page 5

20kHz and .1T.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner

should be directed to Jennifer A. Poker whose telephone number is 703-305-4037. The examiner can

normally be reached on 5:30-4:00 Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor,

Elvin G. Enad can be reached on 703-308-7619. The fax phone number for the organization where

this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should

be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1782.

Jap

November 26, 2003